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Abstract

This dissertation offers the first study of contemporary uses of running as a form of transport. Recognising its omission from academic policy literature, two manifestations of running-transport were explored over the course of this project. Surveys and a mix of go-along and ordinary interviews were used to gain understandings of run-commuting. This practice we deemed to be an emerging commuting mode in which run-commuters have undergone an active reimagining of what commuting is and the value of travel-time. Mostly used for time-efficiency by utilising incumbent moments of mobility to undertake running training; run-commuting was also used to provide opportunities for time-out, to transition between work and home as well as explore and engage with the local environment. Run-commuting was also found to be a practice heavily reliant on other forms of mobility to actualise it and a range of end-of-trip facilities to help overcome the vast logistical issue that run-commuting poses. The second form of running-transport under investigation was that of emergency-running which are unplanned, extemporaneous and often undesired moments of mobility that people perform when in lieu of other means and with a necessity to get from A to B. An ethnography of emergency-running in a train station was undertaken and highlighted the way in which the material site of the train station, social interaction with other station users and the embodied experiences of running all coalesced to encourage and discourage emergency-running in different ways. These two elements were brought together to show the pervasiveness of running-transport and the range of people who utilise it in contemporary societies in order to undertake an appraisal of running as a transport mode. Recognising its limits in distance, speed and likeability, running was deemed to offer an important alternative active form of transport for local urban mobility that could be encouraged through awareness-raising and the provision of end-of-trip facilities. This research has also invited a greater academic and policy engagement with running-transport, setting out an agenda for future research and highlighting the academic debates it can engage with.
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Part One
A Rundown of Running

Running is a curious, kaleidoscopic and diverse form of movement. Over the course of history this mobile form has served in a complex set of cultural, political and biological contexts (Whelan, 2012) as its role and the meanings ascribed to it have changed over time. A brief dash through its history reveals how running has been fundamental to human evolution (Bramble and Lieberman, 2004; Carrier et al, 1984; Lieberman and Bramble, 2007; Rolian et al, 2009), been utilised in cultural rituals (Guttmann, 2004), been developed as a gymnastic endeavour (Vettenniemi, 2012), and assisted in messenger services (Bale, 2011) among others. The latter serves as a crucial reminder that at its core, running involves getting to somewhere from somewhere else; it is a locational displacement.


The research contained within this project however, is concerned with contemporary and anglocentric forms of running. As cultures, lifestyles, technologies, land-use and geographies have changed, the hegemonic discourses around running have shifted and it is scarcely perceived as a form of transport any longer. Whilst elsewhere there are still occurrences (see *Born to Run* by Christopher McDougall [2010]), current anglocentric discourses regarding running revolve around sport, fitness and health. These understandings are actually quite recent, the increasing ubiquity and normalisation of running not truly occurring until the running boom of the 1970s (Latham, forthcoming; Tanio, 2012). But such is the pervasiveness of these understandings, that running as a form of transport is wholly unaccounted for in analyses of contemporary running and contemporary transport modes.
But this does not mean that running is not used as a means of transport however. If we consider transport, at its simplest, to be the vehicle through which people and things travel from one place to another, then running that takes such a form readily starts to reveal itself. The existence of run-commuters, people who lace up their trainers to get to and/or from work has been very lightly touched upon in my previous research (Cook, 2013). This represents a purposeful, intentional and planned form of running-transport. Other forms of running-transport can be unintended, extemporaneous and undesired moments of mobility that are part of the makeup of everyday life. Pause long enough at any road crossing, bus stop or train station and the sight of people dashing in an emergency form of running-transport will come along soon enough. Such emergency-runners often have a very different relationship to running, holding different meanings and having different experiences of running, yet still use it as a form of transport. Running-transport actually appears to be a very normal practice, one that can be both positive and negative but one which is rarely discussed and very little is known about.

The idea that running can be a form of transport, and a good one at that, is gaining much purchase particularly in London and the UK. A predominantly an awareness-raising, tip-sharing and encouragement-giving campaign called Run2Work (2014) is currently underway. This well-supported movement promotes monthly Run2Work days, the first one attracting an estimated 10,000 run-commuters (Bryant, 2014). There is much buzz and enthusiasm about running-transport with its benefits being espoused on many different platforms. This is perhaps epitomised by a video published on 12 August 2014 titled Race the Tube – Sprint (Epic Challenges, 2014). The clip shows a man on a Circle Line underground train approaching Mansion House station. When the doors open he sprints out, up the stairs, through the barriers and along the 380m to Cannon Street station, returning through the barriers, down the stairs and through the open doors of the carriage he left not 80 seconds ago. The point? It can be just as quick, if not quicker, to get around by running as other modes of transport.
This study offers the first steps to filling the void of knowledge about contemporary uses of running as transport. Not only does it provide the first investigation of run-commuting, and emergency-running but if offers a timely and critical analysis of running’s role and potential as a transport mode for contemporary society. In doing so, the study is a provocation. Each way of running-transport exhibits a different subjectivity and way of relating to the practice of running, challenging our understandings of both running and transport.

Running Targets

Having recognised the clear gap between some running practices and their study, the overall aim for this dissertation was to understand and critically analyse running as a form of transport. This was a purposively broad aim with the intention of starting to build knowledge around running-transport practices. This was achieved by adhering to the following objectives:

- To gain initial understandings of run-commuting
- To investigate the phenomenon of emergency-running
- To analyse running as a mode of transport and explore ways for it to be encouraged.

The Route Map

From here we head straight out to the literature review, providing an overview of how running has been understood and researched hitherto. After which, we turn towards an explanation and justification of the method selection before arriving at the crux of the thesis, successive chapters offering insights into run-commuting and emergency-running. Coming around the final bend, we enter a discussion about the merits and downfalls of running as a transport mode and strategies for its promotion before entering the home straight of the conclusion. This not only summarises the key findings of the research, future research but draws out the advancement it has made to particular debates and fields.
Setting Out: Literature Review

Geography and Running

Running is essentially about movement. Yet, the two strands of Geography that have traditionally or contemporarily taken movement as their central concern have had very little engagement with this mobile form, particularly as a transport mode (Cidell, 2014 does note its occasional use as transport, but little more). Running appears to have “fallen through the cracks” in both mobilities research and transport geography (Cidell, 2014: p.571).

A well-recited mobilities turn is said to have taken hold of the social sciences (and beyond) over the last decade or two, becoming animated by issues of being-on-the-move (Adey, 2009; Cresswell, 2001; 2006; 2011; 2012; 2014; Hannam et al, 2006; Merriman, forthcoming; Urry and Sheller, 2006). This agenda, influenced by nonrepresentational theories and theories of practice (Merriman, 2012), has initiated a wide-ranging corpus of work that addresses the way people move and how movement affects human experiences and relationships with place, space, time, others and oneself (Cresswell, 2010; Fincham et al, 2010). As such, various studies have considered cycling (Spinney, 2009), train travel (Bissell, 2009); bus and coach travel (Jain, 2009; 2011), flying (Adey, 2010), driving (Laurier, 2004) and walking (Middleton, 2009) among others (see Vannini, 2009). Running stands as a surprising omission from this research agenda with very few studies being done under the mobilities banner. Considering its popularity as a mobile form (see Layton, 2014), its elusion from widespread study is quite the quandary.

Running may be an oversight in the mobilities literature, but it effectively represents an abyss within transport. The academic discipline of transport geography occasionally nods to a recognition that running can be used as a transportation mode, but little more (Millward et al, 2013; Schwanen and Mokhtarian, 2005a; 2005b). Transport policy and practitioners fail to attend to running at all in their analyses, designs and strategies – it being included somewhat unceremoniously as ‘other’, if at all (National Travel Survey, 2013). Running is obviously an active mode of transport, yet literature on
this category of transit is dominated by a concern for walking and cycling (Pooley et al, 2013; Shannon et al, 2006). This study critically analyses the case for running to be considered alongside walking and cycling as an active transport mode, representing alternative pathways for transport futures.

The lack of attention paid to running from the sympathies and sensibilities of mobilities and transport geography, provides the opportunity to conduct a study that equally draws from and adds to both camps in valuable ways. Such an endeavour has been heavily encouraged by commentators in recent years, arguing that the rhetoric of the mobilities turn has simply overlooked longer engagements with movement across academia (Merriman et al, 2013) and in geography, namely the study of transport (Shaw and Sidaway, 2011; Shaw and Docherty, 2014). Often caricatured as being concerned with very different aspects of movement (abstract and contextually-meaningful respectively), exploring the parallels between transport geography and mobilities research has actually revealed a continuum of research diversity (Shaw and Hesse, 2010). Conversations between these two sets of researchers has been lacking hitherto and although certainly increasing (see Adey et al, 2011; Adey et al, 2012; Grieco and Urry, 2012), Shaw and Hesse (2010) contend there is still much dialogue to be had and things of value to be gleaned from one another. This project attempted to do just that.

Writings about Running

I do not want to overemphasise the paucity of running research however. Work has certainly been done but is scattered across many disciplines, approaches and eras. Indeed, research is even increasing but as yet, it has not been considered as a form of transport. This does not, however, negate the usefulness or relevance of this work to the study undertaken. Research on running has highlighted the highly fractious but multiplicitous nature of the practice and as such, running that is undertaken for transport purposes is highly unlikely to solely be about transport – it will entangle many meanings, experiences and movements of running. Thus, it is important to grasp what has been done before on running that can inform a study of running as transport and the gaps this project has
attempted to fill. To present this review, I will utilise the facets of mobility identified by Cresswell (2001; 2010) as themes under which to categorise what has already been written about running. These consist of the brute facts of movement, the meanings of movement, and the experience of movement.

The brute facts of movement, in essence, concern the abstract specifics of mobility: questions about the who, when, where, duration, speed and frequency of movement. Sadly, in relation to running such data are difficult to come by, something Winters (1980) has noted previously. Despite runners’ current status as ubiquitous urban figures (Latham, forthcoming), there is still limited material regarding the ‘brute facts’ of their movements. Similarly, there is no means by which to grasp how the aggregate data that does exist, relates to the different ways of running – such as running for transport purposes. Sport England’s Active People Survey has begun to provide some understandings about who is running and how often they run.

A sharp rise of participation in athletics in England has been witnessed over recent years, totalling just over two million in 2012/2013 (Sport England, 2013). This participation is most likely to be on a once-a-week basis (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2012). In absolute terms, the largest single group of road runners in England consists of 35 to 44 year old males who hold higher income jobs and have no limiting disability. Until recently, knowledge about where and when people run was extremely scant and anecdotal at best. Another Sport England (2012b) survey has indicated that 80% of runners frequent the roads, 56% utilise local parks/off-road areas and only 10% patronise the track (although club members are five times more likely to visit the latter). Most markedly, runners’ routes tend to be pointless – they begin and finish in the same location (Cook, 2013) - with very few routes embodying the classic ‘transport’ mantra of getting from A to B. Running can therefore be seen an quasi-antithetical to transport, something this study obviously seeks to provoke.

Despite being described in rather abstract terms hitherto, such movements are actually saturated with masses of meaning. Numerous authors over recent decades have expounded representations of running – none, however, addressing running as transport. Tanio (2012) suggests three categories
that such meanings fall into: sport, health and those that are experience-orientated – the former two being predominant. In sportised running, there is a concern with how fast bodies can move, seeking quicker times and the improvement of performance (Shipway and Jones, 2008; Vettteniemi, 2012; Whelan, 2012). Indeed, Bale (2004, 2011) contends that the sweat, strive and labour some runners devote to reducing times can function to recast running as a work rather than a leisure activity (Hockey and Allen-Collinson, 2013). Representations of running in relation to health emerge from its function as an exercise mode associated with campaigns to adopt fitter lifestyles (Latham, forthcoming; Shipway and Holloway, forthcoming; Vettteniemi, 2012; Winters, 1980). Especially resonant with older runners (Dionigi et al 2013; Tulle, 2007), the practice of fitness running took hold as a means of offsetting the ill-effects of progressively inactive lifestyles. Such stimuli remain significant today as governments seek to tackle rising obesity levels by promoting healthy living and physical well-being (Herrick, 2011; forthcoming; Shipway and Holloway, 2010).

Experience-orientated representations of running are impressively varied in character. Running has been fashioned as a transgressive practice by several authors, who reason that it resists the customs of modern achievement sport and challenges the supremacy of motorised mobility through an appropriation and ‘claiming back’ of the streets (Bale, 2000; 2003; 2004; 2011; Cidell, 2014; Winters, 1980). This taking of space can position running as a tool for exploration in becoming a medium through which to gain place knowledge (Lorimer, 2012). The opportunity to be somewhere else, experience something else and get away through running has led some commentators to represent road-running as a form of escape, offering a reprieve from the convolutions and commotions of everyday life (Allen-Collinson and Hockey, 2001; Bale, 2004; Cook, 2013; Seagrave, 2000; Shipway and Jones, 2008). Indeed, the practice of habitual escape has led to suggestions of running comprising a quasi-spiritual endeavour (Spooner, 2014). Others have revealed running’s sociability, in that it acts as means of forging and maintaining social relationships (Allen-Collinson, 2008; Dionigi et al, 2013; Layton, 2014; Shipway et al, 2013; Tulle, 2007).

Not all representations are positive, however. One view holds running as a form of punishment, often related to the enforced school run (Bale, 2008). Many runners can reconcile such pessimism
with the positive utility to be gained from running – fashioning it as a chore (Cook, 2013). Equally, such negativity can be turned on its head. The exertion and suffering often allied to running also imagines it as a feat, and many runners like to rise to a challenge (Shipway and Jones, 2008; Townsend, 2012; Vettenniemi, 2012, Whelan, 2012). Running as transport clearly sits awkwardly and provocatively with representations of running studied thus far. Yet Cook (2013), has shown how runners often actively ascribe multiple meanings to their practice, inviting a consideration of how running as transport may be encouraged, discouraged or co-constituted by and entangled with these other meanings.

Relatively little work has paid attention to the actual experiences of ‘doing’ road-running, particularly running in a transport context. The core of a runner’s experience is their body, and the experiences of the running body are mostly detected by the senses (Allen-Collinson, 2011; Maivorsdotter and Quennerstedt, 2012). The senses are mediators between the body, society and environment and are enormously apposite to runners as they see, hear, feel, touch and smell their runs (Allen-Collinson and Hockey, 2011; forthcoming; Hockey, 2006; 2013; Hockey and Allen-Collinson, 2007, 2013; Lorimer, 2012). The senses are vital to ‘doing’ running by, among other things, assessing aptitude, measuring pace toleration, detecting terrain, gauging propinquity and evaluating safety, particularly when running together. Material accoutrements are also important to the accomplishment of running and authors have drawn attention to the idea of running as an assemblage. The kind of clothing associated with running is significant in that it can provide improved functionality, facilitate the identification of runners, attract (un)wanted attention or prompt memories and constellations of mobility (Allen-Collinson, 2010; 2011; Shipway and Jones, 2008). Work is still needed to better understand how bodies and technologies come together to accomplish a run (cf. Spooner, 2014), especially in relation to a more extensive range of materialities such as trainers, water bottles, rucksacks, watches, and MP3 players. The materialities of transport runners will enlighten this somewhat.

A theme recurring throughout the literature on the running body is that of the body in conflict. Most commonly of interest are tales of conflicts between the physical body and a runner’s mind.
Shipway and Jones (2008) write about the frequent and clear conflict between the mind’s determination to continue and the body’s resolve to halt, an experience exaggerated by fatigue. The opposite of this is the ‘runner’s high’. Described by authors as experiencing effortless effort, a seduction of rhythmicity and an enduring sense of comfort, the runner's high provides an amplified sensitivity to the present (Lorimer 2010; 2012; Tanio, 2012; Whelan, 2012). It is also possible for these running lows and highs to exist within a gamut of emotions: elation, pain, freedom, apprehension, pleasure, frustration and euphoria among others (Bale, 2004; Farquhar et al, 2011; Lorimer, 2012; Shipway and Jones, 2008; Spooner, 2014; Whelan, 2012).

While mind and physical body are obviously central to the running experience, they do not exist in a vacuum. Running is an interaction between the body and environment (Eichberg, 1990; also see Winters 1980). The interaction between the runner and topography is one of the most intense; runners move across various surfaces and gradients, perceiving terra firma and its corporeal implications (Allen-Collinson and Hockey, 2011; Hockey and Allen-Collinson, 2006; Lorimer, 2012). The majority of runners in the UK however, perform their running in the predominately-concreted surfaces of public-space (see Sport England, 2012b). Runners are habituated to running in such arenas, yet there are no natural conventions or normative behaviours to regulate the co-habitation of this space and the avoidance of possible conflicts (Hockey and Allen-Collinson, 2007; 2013). Responsibility for such encounters often falls on runners’ shoulders who develop an arsenal of body-spatial techniques to successfully negotiate such transient propinquities (Cook, 2013). Topics that have received little more than cursory observations in relation to running include travel-time use/utility and stillness on-the-run, despite both themes commanding significant attention in the broader social sciences (Bissell and Fuller, 2011; Jain and Lyons, 2008). These ideas present intriguing aspects to investigate in an exploration of running as a mode of transport.

Where next?

Running as a form of transport if clearly a large omission from running research hitherto; it simply doesn’t exist. The practices of run-commuting and emergency-running thus sit provocatively to
current understandings of running and thus their study has been able to advance many of the debates surrounding the movements, meanings and experiences of running, as well as providing insights to the role it can play in contemporary transport and ways for it to be encouraged. First of all however, a run through the methods employed to research running-transport is required.
Going Ahead: Methods

The method selection employed in this research was eclectic and unreservedly so. This was something of a necessity in order to carry out the research project I have set up herein. To gain understandings about the two very different types of running-transport and to truly work across the transport-mobilities continuum a certain degree of methodological mixing was very much in order. Therefore I employed some of the much venerated ‘mobile methods’ (Büscher et al, 2010; Büscher and Urry, 2009; D’Andrea et al, 2011; Ricketts-Hein et al, 2008) but also methods more familiar to transport studies – sympathising with Merriman’s (2014) call to ‘rethink mobile methods’. The specific methods I used are un- or little-tested in running research and certainly presented their own challenges when in the field, something I will examine further below.

Researching Run-Commuting

The brute facts of movement were investigated through the use of surveys, a tool capable of exploring people’s habits, behaviours and attitudes (McLafferty, 2010). Two separate surveys were created but both contained the same core of questions regarding the prevalence, distances, durations, facilities, benefits and drawbacks of run-commuting and thus were aimed at both run-commuters and non-run-commuters. The first (see Appendix 1) was a survey that sought more explanatory answers from a smaller sample. This sample was based in the town of Guildford and was drawn from local running clubs and businesses. This survey received 49 completed responses and ran from 1 July 2014 to 14 July 2014. This survey was then edited in partnership with the Run2Work campaign with the aim of receiving a greater number of responses but with more descriptive answers. This survey (Appendix 2) went live on the 21 July 2014 and is still ongoing. At the time of writing it has received 151 completed responses and has been distributed solely on social media sites with much greater targeting towards runners and run-commuters. The gender balance on this survey erred slightly towards women, making up 51.3% of respondents. This survey also achieved a much greater geographical spread despite 48.4% of responses coming solely from London. Both
surveys were hosted on the online survey platform SurveyGizmo and then analysed using simple statistics to draw out the main trends and patterns.

To accompany these survey, interviews with ten run-commuters were also conducted. The five men and five women (see Table I) were drawn from the initial explanatory survey with the aim of conducting go-along interviews. Such a technique prioritises being there and engaging in motion that generates rich data as participants are prompted by the surrounding environment to discuss feelings, emotions, connections, and memories (Anderson, 2004; Holton and Riley, 2014; Jones et al, 2008). However, as will be discussed in pages to come, run-commuting is a more infrequent and less predictable practice, which meant that five (plus one phone interview) of the interviews were ‘ordinary’ interviews that incorporated a participative route-mapping exercise with a similar effect. From these interviews I was able to better understand participants’ mobile subjectivities, their relationship to running and experiences of run-commuting. The meanings of running were also interpreted from these conversations; it was what they talked about when they talked about running that gave such insights.

The one phone, four go-along and five ordinary interviews were all conducted between 17 and 24 July 2014. With the results of the survey driving the discussion about run-commuting, an in-depth transcription and coding process were not undertaken. Rather passages were transcribed that related to the broad themes arising from the survey and coded for the nuances of the arguments (Cope, 2010).

Table I. Participant pseudonyms and interview information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interview Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17/07/2014</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18/07/2014</td>
<td>Go-Along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19/07/2014</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
<td>Go-Along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
<td>Go-Along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22/07/2014</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23/07/2014</td>
<td>Go-Along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23/07/2014</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inga</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23/07/2014</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24/07/2014</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researching Emergency-Running

Researching emergency-running required methods that relied more heavily on observation given the difficulty in conversing with people who are, by definition, in a rush. This dissertation took the train station as its focus; researching those passengers that have to hurry through the station to make their departing train. Conducting an ethnography allowed not only for an indicative understanding of the brute facts of movements but also clues about how this running was experienced and the immense importance of the physical site of the station having agency over running. This in-the-field-observation allowed me to grasp atmospheres, affects, and the less-visible, multisensory elements of emergency-running (a key attribute of contemporary ethnography and geography – Paterson, 2009; Pink, 2009; Stoller, 1997) as well as the moments of transition, physical movements, body language and facial expressions. Ideally, I would have employed video-ethnography alongside to help capture the moments of mobility but this request was denied by South West Trains who insisted on no photography.

I was able to get permission to conduct this research at Guildford Station (managed by South West Trains) through Twitter after other routes proved fruitless and undertook a pilot study on 24 June 2014 in which I spent 8 hours in the station trialling locations and time periods. With the aim of understanding the rhythms of emergency-running and how the mobility changed throughout the station and day I settled on four locations studied on consecutive weekdays and over three time periods. Between the 09 and 14 July I observed emergency-running between 07.00 – 09.00; 12.00 – 14.00; and 15.30 – 18.30 in the ticket hall and entrance, at the gateline, in the underpass, and on platform five. As the physical design of the station forms a key component of the analysis in Chapter 5, I will resist providing a location plan until then.

The precise strategy I adopted for observing and note-taking was very much based on trial and error. These moments of mobility were fleeting which made observing them and taking useful, detailed notes challenging. Each site offered very different opportunities for doing such tasks. Some, such as platform five, had distinct waves of runners which entailed a concentrated observations and
shorthand jottings for a few minutes followed by a fifteen minute reprieve for fleshing out the scribbles. Others, such as the ticket hall, were much less rhythmical which meant taking the opportunity to note down an example of emergency-running could result in missing others. Despite my best efforts, this has probably resulted in skewing the observations, tending to record the running moments that somehow stood out or where in isolation. Once complete, the jottings were all typed up and tallies of particular characteristics of emergency-running observed made. The precise figures of these tallies aren’t important however given the levels of underestimation and bias within them. What are more useful are the patterns, trends and attributes they demonstrate and which ultimately steered the themes of analysis.
Part Two
Run-Commuting

In total, 116 run-commuters shared their brute facts, representations and experiences of run-commuting with me over the two surveys and ten interviews. I will use these categories to structure this chapter but in reality, these three facets are wholly entangled and their (overlapped) separation is solely for analytical purposes. Unfortunately the confines of a dissertation chapter are far too small a space to properly unfurl what was researched in full. As such, I will only present the work that seems most salient to run-commuting. Acknowledging the current lacunas in research and the points at which run-commuting diverges from other running practices, there is going to be an extended section on the brute facts of movement and shorter sections on the meanings and experiences. There is, however, much more to be known about a type of running that is visibly, experientially and perceptively different to other types of running.

The Brute Facts of Run Commuting

Running is rarely the sole or principal mode of transport for run-commuters. This is a significant as everything about run-commuting is thus in a relationship/competition with another form of transport with great bearing upon its brute facts, meanings and experiences. For 97.3% of respondents to the descriptive survey, there was always an alternative mode of transport and these were most commonly cycling (33%) and the train (25.8%); the heavy sway towards London-based run-commuters being significant in these figures. But when commuters do decide to run, the first notable thing about their mobility is their shape, something that seems to set it apart from other forms of running. Whereas most running routes tend to be pointless (Cook, 2013), run-commuting does not represent such undirected travel (Cao et al, 2009). Rather, it very much fulfils the old transport adage of getting from A to B as seen in Fig.1.
Figure 1. Run-commuting shapes
But who are running these lines? In relation to gender there was a 63%-37% split in favour of male run-commuters (Fig. 2), a ratio with a slightly greater skew than results for running in general where only 60% are men (Sport England, 2012a). Interestingly though, this is a more equitable than cycle-commuting where women only make up 26.8% of the cycle-commuting-population (Office for National Statistics [ONS], 2014a). The most common age of run-commuters was between 35 and 44 (Fig. 3), a fact that mirrors wider running participation trends (Sport England, 2012a).

Figure 2. Gender balance of run-commuters

Figure 3. Age composition of run-commuters
The length of time run-commuters have been travelling to and from work in such a way varied quite dramatically, the explanatory survey yielding a range of six months to 26 years. The descriptive survey revealed that for many run-commuters, this is quite a new transport mode with a total of 61% having been run-commuting for less than two years (Fig. 4). Based on these figures, the number of people run-commuting has more than doubled in the last two years. For most, they took up run-commuting as it offers the chance to kill two birds with one stone. All respondents had to commute to work and most spoke of a need to train as well. In such cases respondents often took advantage of incumbent moments of mobility to “get the miles in” (survey response). The catalyst for run-commuting was often increasing time constraints that made running outside of their commute more difficult, such as longer working hours or “new born babies” (survey response). Alternatively a participant needing to increase their mileage (as when marathon training) equally required them to grab the time-saving opportunities of running their commute. All in all, run-commuters tended to take up the practice as it allowed them to more easily “fit [running] into my work/family life” (survey response).

Figure 4. Number of years run-commuters have been run-commuting
The distance runners in the study needed to commute tended to vary greatly. Some were as short as a mile while others were covering over 40 miles (Fig. 5). The most common distance bracket was between 2 – 4.99 miles however and around three quarters were under the 10 mile mark. This is still quite a distance and such a prospect is one of the most common reasons people did not run-commute - “did you see how far it was?” as one survey respondent put it. However, only 72.6% of people in the descriptive survey actually ran the entire distance, they would often travel part-way by another means (Fig. 6). Understandably those with longer commutes tended to do this more often with 72% of those with a commute over 10 miles running under half of the way whereas 89.3% of those with commutes under 10 miles ran the whole distance. The train was the run-commuters most common additional form of transport with 71% of part-way run-commuters using it to complete their journeys (Fig. 7). The term ‘runnable distance’ cropped up often in interviews in relation to commuting. Once again this varied with personal preference and abilities but one put as his maximum:

“Probably ten miles or less for me but other people are faster and fitter you know. But for me, if I lived more than then miles away I just don’t think I could physically do that.”

Frank, phone interview, 22/07/2014

Unexpectedly, many run-commuters also discussed a minimum distance they considered to be worthwhile running. This tended to be between one and three miles and was based upon the bodily reactions and desires from this form of transport along with the beyond-journey time requirements of active commuting. As one explained:

“I could run to work from the train and that would be quicker but I would be annoyed in a way … that wouldn’t be far enough maybe, which is what maybe a mile
or something. It would almost be frustrating to get sweaty for that distance and I’d have to shower and go through all that stuff.”

Inga, interview, 23/07/2014

**Figure 5.** Distance run-commuters travel to work

**Figure 6.** Percentage of the journey to/from work completed by running
How such distances translate into duration is also very variable given the differentials in speed between run-commuters. In terms of time spent running, 76.1% of runners ran for over 30 minutes on their commute, whilst the most common time range was 60 minutes and over (Fig. 8). At the other end of the scale, 2.7% of run-commuters ran for under ten minutes. In some cases this represented a quicker commute than the alternative modes: “I can run in to work in around 18 minutes, which is quicker than driving through traffic” (survey response). For many though, this represents a significant increase in travelling time with the national average for all modes standing at 27 minutes from home to work (ONS, 2014b) and only 24 minutes for an average bike commute (Department for Transport [DfT], 2014a). In the discourse of travel time savings, which operates under the assumption that there is no intrinsic value to be gained by travelling (Metz, 2008), it may seem perverse that run-commuters opt for a more enduring commute. The realisation that travel time can actually be a ‘gift’ (Jain and Lyons, 2008) however has clearly been made by run-commuters who are re-imagining their commute as productive. Whilst having a smaller repertoire of activities to do on the move in comparison to other modes (see Lyons et al, 2007; 2013; Lyons and Urry, 2005), the longer journey gifts run-commuters the chance to complete a run (and all the benefits this brings) and to free up time elsewhere that can also be used productively.
Running is a highly flexible mobile form, it allows the traversal of surfaces and infrastructures that other modes can’t and it is free from the restraints of tracks, timetables, speed restrictions or codes of conduct. It is a very uninhibited mobile form but generally run-commuters in this study took the most direct route they could from A to B, with 65% doing so. The pressure some felt to get to work, make their train or get home on time undoubtedly had an impact on this choice. For 30% of respondents to the descriptive survey, this directness entailed traversing the same route as they would by their other modes of transport. The majority however used a different route when run-commuting, an act that achieved a directness that other modes are incapable of. In doing so, these run-commuters went through a process of reimaging their mental geographies of how best to get from one point to another:

“I was running this Christmas Pie trail [a trail in Guildford] with some guys from work and I looked it up and ... that actually goes past where I live. So then it was immediately, that’s now an option. You know, I don’t have to run alongside all the cars … which doesn’t appeal to me …If you draw a line from just under where I live to where I work, it’s just like a little winding path straight there – which is perfect. If
you go on the roads or another path, you probably add on about another mile.

Because it is a run to work, I am always under time pressure to get there.”

Gary, go-along, 23/07/2014

Invariably these different-to-other-mode-routes involve the use of a much wider range of infrastructures, surfaces and conduits of mobility. As seen in Fig. 9, pavements remain the most prevalent running arena (see Sport England, 2012b) but there is also a significant presence of mobility channels that are only possible because these commuters are on foot, including pedestrianised areas, alleyways, and trails. These alternative infrastructures, that often remove runners from the roadside, are the reason some run-commute in the first place. Many run-commuters spoke of their desire for a “nice route away from traffic” (survey response), in doing so experiencing something altogether more aesthetically pleasing:

“In terms of the route that I do, I think this is 90% of the reason I actually run-commute is because, I can’t hear the road now and I’m somewhere that’s quite nice to be … Being an artist, I appreciate my surroundings. So like along here, I know there are loads of squirrels and they run away from me. And I look forward to that stuff.”

Gary, go-along, 23/07/2014

Figure 9. Run-commuting infrastructures
The most intriguing and surprisingly complex question about run-commuting however was the question of when. With such competition between transport modes and for runners’ time, what makes a commuter decide to commute by running on any given day? The headline figures can be seen in Figs 10-12 that report the most common run-commuting frequency is two to three times a week (45.1%), with 14.2% running on a much more occasional basis and 8.8% of run-commuters doing so every day. With 90% of run-commuters working full-time, week days eclipse weekends for run-commuting prevalence. The yearly rhythms of run-commuting seem fairly constant with 86.6% of run-commuters professing to run the whole year round and 13.4% being fair-weather summer run-commuters only.

Figure 10. Run-commuting frequency
Figure 11. Run-commuting rate per day of the week

Figure 12. Run-commuting seasonality
However, such aggregated data hide a highly complex decision making process and logistical operation to actualise run-commuting on any given day – in sum, run-commuting must fit with the rest of life’s rhythms for it to occur. Rarely can a run-commute be spontaneous as participants discussed many variables that need to be in harmony. These can include the training schedule, work requirements, evening events, dependents’ transport needs and ensuring that the objects and stuff related to these activities are in the correct location or cartable. On top of this there are bodily considerations such as fitness, injuries and laziness to contend with as well as environmental factors such as poor weather, water-logged ground or extreme heat. The choice between commuting-modes often comes down to convenience, time and geography.

Meanings and Representations of Run-Commuting

The most common meanings of running espoused by run-commuters aligned with the supremacy of the sport/fitness discourses. They weren’t the only representations of running that cropped up during the research however and whilst I will cleave them apart for the purposes of analysis now, most run-commuters held several of these representations simultaneously and it is often because of the intersections and the cumulative power of these meanings that they run-commute.

As mentioned in the literature review, sportised meanings of running are relatively hegemonic contemporarily and revolve around the desire for bodies to increase in velocity, to reduce their time over uniform distances, to have success in competitions and achieve personal bests. Now, none of the 49.5% of participants who declared running to be their sport spoke in such terms. What was discussed in abundance however was the role run-commuting played in training and training is an essential component of running habits for those with sporting ambition:

“Allows me to fit training for races into my work/family life” (survey response)
“Time effective way to get in training miles” (survey response)

“It provides training time that I wouldn’t otherwise be able to justify” (survey response)

Being a competitive runner is not a prerequisite for run-commuting however as 28.3% of respondents to the descriptive survey described running as predominately an exercise choice and 73.7% stated the main reason they ran-commute was because it keeps them fit and healthy. Such understandings of running revolve around its ability to improve general fitness and the advantages it has for a person’s physical and general wellbeing:

“The boost of knowing you’re doing something worthwhile, getting fitter, getting healthier. I find it changes your diet as well, like for some reason … it makes you want to eat better food … So yeah it affects quite a lot of my life beneficially and that’s why I try and stick at it.”

Billy, go-along, 18/07/2014

Many experience-oriented representations of running permeate through run-commuters’ reasoning and practices but three in particular seemed to be continually recurring and therefore pertinent to run-commuting: escape, exploration, and fun. Having written about the way running acts as a means of escape previously (Cook, 2013), I do not want to labour the point but nuances were discussed in the research. Many participants described how run-commuting acted as an escape by providing them with a “good way to end a stressful day at work” (survey response) and “relaxing the mind” (survey response). In such cases, run-commuting acted to gift runners time out, in the words of Jain and Lyons (2008), gifting them time to themselves that they may struggle to achieve throughout the rest of the day that once more provides compelling evidence of the value of travel-time and reasons why a slower, longer commute may be desired:

“You can actually think … and turn my mind to creative stuff or things I want to do in my spare time. It’s sort of that time to … you know because if you have kids it is
full on when you’re home, that’s all you’re doing, you’re looking after them … so it’s my own time, it’s great.”

Gary, go-along, 23/07/2014

It is the escape from/to somewhere meanings that take on slightly different manifestations in run-commuting. Often what runners are escaping from are the alternatives – the normal commute or route – and are escaping to a run-commute or a more pleasing running environment. This can take the form of negativity about other transport modes or routes – “I avoid the horrible tube” (survey response) – or the supremacy of run-commuting and its routes – “Less traffic and fumey pavements” (survey response), “roadside is more direct but trail is prettier” (survey response). This escaping to somewhere also ties into running’s role as an exploratory tool, offering the chance to see something different and visit new places. This was heavily used by many runners as witnessed in the number who took different routes and used a range of mobility infrastructures when run-commuting, engaging with spaces and gaining place knowledge as they did:

“It was a really nice area, you could choose to go through pine forests, heathland or different routes. Running was almost a way of seeing more stuff … it’s like what is over there?”

Eddie, go-along, 21/07/2014

The final representation that became apparent in the research and is extremely salient to run-commuting is that of running as an enjoyable, fun practice. Something only fleetingly discussed in the running literature thus far and unfortunately it was a topic participants did not dwell on in much depth. In the descriptive survey 22.2% described running as their hobby above all else – a term that is synonymous with something done regularly for pleasure. Others stated that their main reason for run-commuting was: “fun” (survey response) and “love running” (survey response) while one interviewee reflected on her recent run-commuting uptake with:
“I wish I had done more in the past seeing how much I enjoy it now … I just go with the flow that I am enjoying it now and I’m happy I got into it … I do have this route and I enjoy it whilst I can still do it.”

Harriet, interview, 23/07/2014

The reactions of colleagues to participant’s choice to run-commute were also insightful to understanding representations of run-commuting. Two types of reactions were commonly recounted by run-commuters that both stemmed from running’s representation as a challenge (run-commuting is a physical, logistical and a conceptual challenge) and this being overcome. One was of disbelief and considering it to be crazy: “some people are like ‘how far is it?’, ‘about 10k or so, 6 miles’. ‘Are you mad!!’” (Jack, interview, 24/07/2014) and the other of admiration: “they think it’s an amazing thing to do … they are quite impressed by it I think” (Alison, interview, 17/07/2014). Some run-commuters also thought the latter of their practice, being proud to be able to get places under their own steam and challenging ideas of what a commute looks like/can be. This said, running was not represented as a means of transport by any run-commuters until prompted to consider it - at which, the jury seems to be out. Some deemed the basic fact that they are getting to where they needed to go or that another mode was being replaced to entail their running was a form of transport: “it’s great that is has a benefit that I enjoy it and I keep fit but it is definitely – ‘I got to work today’… it is my mode of transport” (Gary, go-along, 23/07/2014). Others however, perceived that they were running purely for sporting reasons and it was just serendipitous that they managed to get to work at the same time: “I still just see it as I’m going for a run” (Diana, go-along, 21/07/2014). Another group of run-commuters just considered their experiences of run-commuting too distance from what commutes feel like for them to class it as a form of transport: “I don’t think I have thought of it as a form of transport. I see it as part of my journey but I am not sure I would describe it as a form of transport” (Alison, interview, 17/07/2014). Those who did not consider running to be a form of transport have arguably reimagined what a commute can be to such a degree that they no longer recognise the commuting aspect of it.
The Experiences of Run-Commuting

As is the entangled nature of the three facets of mobility, the discussion of meanings and brute facts thus far has already touched upon many of the experiences of run-commuting. Therefore this section will cover some those experiences that are most salient to run-commuters – exertion, energy, and backpacks. This discussion will also tease out some of the less mobile things that run-commuting is reliant upon, the facilities and moorings that enable it to happen.

The most obvious experience to recount is the fact that running involves physical exertion, it can be difficult and is something that results in sweaty, tired and pained bodies:

“sometimes I'll have run on the Wednesday and I'll have to run in on the Thursday morning and my muscles just won't have recovered. And I've done the run but it's killed me to do it because my legs just don't want to work – I feel like I am just carrying my legs.”

Catherine, interview, 19/07/2014

For non-run-commuters, such toil can be very off-putting as running is simply more taxing than other modes: “I cycle or walk instead. Very hilly route which would be hard work [sic]” (survey response). The affect of running upon the commuter’s body can equally be a strong deterrent as “the idea of running to work and then being all hot and sweaty in the office is pretty off-putting” (survey response). Hot, sweaty bodies are an unavoidable outcome of running and as such all runners advocated the necessity of showers to run-commuting and for the 30.3% that did not have adequate workplace shower facilities, 97% of them utilise local gym showers instead. Related to the need to shower, many run-commuters indicated the usefulness of drying racks/rooms to enable their towels and damp clothes to dry (especially if running home) but only 3% had these available. Recognising the potentially cramping and discomfort-inducing effects of being sat down for the day after run-commuting, the opportunity (and space) to stretch was appreciated or desired by some
run commuters. However, to some non-run-commuters, all of these practices add even further time onto a commute that is already elongated: “can’t be bothered having to shower on arrival. I’d rather just sit down and start working” (survey response).

Somewhat perversely, the majority of run-commuters actually described the energy-inducing impacts of running to work that, despite have physically exerted themselves “sets me up for the day ahead” (survey response) and “energisises me for the rest of the day” (survey-response). This phenomenon is well-appreciated by run-commuters:

“I don’t know the exact science behind it but it releases something into your body, endorphins or whatever, and I definitely feel that. You know, I get sort of a buzz. When I get to work I feel like I have got more energy having run in”.

Frank, phone interview, 22/07/2014

There is certainly a feel-good factor about run-commuting that is strongly connected to the idea that it is fun and enjoyable. Indeed 96.6% of run-commuters in the descriptive survey stated that the mental benefits of running were important to them. Such a buzz has knock on benefits in productivity throughout the day but it is also realised in comparison to the transport modes that seem to lack this buzz: “if I have driven in I usually feel quite tired when I get to work and I’d have a coffee” (Inga, interview, 23/07/2014). Although not expressed by anyone directly, there was certainly a sense that commutes undertaken by running were a way of claiming back your commuting time in comparison to modes perceived to be more grinding, which somehow that still felt like work. Run-commuters often said they were “achieving a healthy work-life balance” (survey response) by run-commuting, thus challenging and reimagining the norms of a commute.

As the requirement of showers and drying racks hint towards, run-commuting is certainly achieved and experienced by an assemblage of bodies, objects and things (Adey et al, 2012). Although there are many accoutrements of running that are chronically under-researched there is one piece of matter that was regularly discussed and helps to mark run-commuting apart from other running
practices – that of the rucksack/backpack/bag. Itself a container of many other pieces of matter, a bag was used by 82.8% of run-commuters and acts as a stopgap for the logistical issue of much ‘stuff’ needing to move between locations. This stuff can include wallets, phones, keys, clothes, food, train passes, laptops, make-up and so on but most run-commuters speak of an aim to pack “just the essentials” (survey response). This is because of running’s affect on a bag and in turn, the bag’s affect on the runner. A running body is in a delicate balance with the rhythms of arms swings, legs raises, breaths and footsteps all harmonised to produce a flow. This flow is easily disrupted however and the adding of any weight to the running body (especially a weight that moves cacophonously to the running rhythm) can have an exaggerated affect that makes running uncomfortable:

“I used to have a bag that slid around on my back quite a lot. Especially if it looks a bit bottom heavy, so it’s gonna move from side to side and kind of annoy you a bit. If you are doing a lot of running, you’d probably find that really annoying.”

Eddie, go-along, 21/07/2014

This was something I was concerned about during the research. Having never run with a bag before but donning one for the go-along interviews, I was shocked about just how difficult I found it; my flow, speed, endurance, posture, ability and ultimately my enjoyment all suffered negatively as a result of wearing a bag as it jostled and bounced around on my shoulders and back. The prospect of needing to run with one put some off run-commuting altogether: “as a runner, while I have considered running to work I find it impractical … I don’t like the idea of running with a backpack on my back” (survey response). Those who regularly run with a backpack however did speak of a quick adjustment period to doing so as such for it to no longer bother them. This was helped by two key things – a specialised backpack and some form of storage facilities at work. Various storage facilities were reported by run-commuters that enabled them to leave much ‘stuff’ at work such as desks, secure lockers or a fridge for food. Such facilities helped to reduce the weight and volume of the bag and therefore its corporeal implications when running, an imperative for many run-commuters:
“Bare bones really, just the stuff I need. I actually bought a set of smaller towels just so I don’t have to take a big towel with me because I need to get other things in there you know.”

Gary, go-along, 23/07/2014

But the bag choice itself also helps in this endeavour and a specialised industry has developed around overcoming the issues of running with a bag: “they were really good, they have like a mesh that sits off your back so you don’t get sweaty, they’ve got good storage” (Diana, go-along, 21/07/2014). This said, all the sternum supports, waist straps, load compressions, integrated rain covers, padded laptop sleeves, frames, meshes and hydration compatibilities in the world can still result in issues if you do not use the bag correctly:

“[arrived at work and stopped running] O my bag is actually open. Shit. I’ve probably lost my T-shirt there I think. Never mind. I’m sure I did that up. So there you go, there is a pitfall of running with a bag.”

Gary, go-along, 23/07/2014

**Conclusion**

This brief overview of run-commuting has provided the first research into the practice, research that identifies its differences to other practices of running but also to practices of commuting. Run-commuters actively undergo a reimagining of what a commute looks like, where it goes, how it feels and what its purposes are. Run-commuting challenges what a commute can be. In doing so run-commuters have realised the value and utility of travel time, opting to linger longer and embracing the benefits this slower mobile mode offers. The experience of run-commuting goes much beyond the run itself however as it is bundled up in a whole series of decisions, considerations, activities,
moorings, facilities and affects that must all come together and be played-off against other transport modes for run-commuting to occur. This includes time-planning, showering, storing, drying, bag-buying, body-stretching and training-schedule-consulting. Such is the logistical undertaking that much motivation is needed to be a run-commuter and this is exemplified by the vast number of sport-runners who utilise incumbent moments of mobility to complete their training. This said, run-commuting rates are on a stunning upward trajectory as people realise the mental, physical and ludic benefits of run-commuting and employers are becoming savvy to the facilities required to support it. All in all, run-commuting is a mobility perched in a complex, ever-changing relationship between movements, stillnesses, ideas and possibilities and is a topic that warrants much further study.
Emergency-Running

Transport-running is not just the preserve of runners with tight schedules however. Indeed, it is a phenomenon seen in the practices of people across the whole spectrum of life and with very different relationships to running. This chapter will focus on one such example of using running to get from A to B, that of emergency-running. Emergency-running is unintended, unplanned and often undesired but is performed by people when, in lieu of other means and with a necessity to get from one place to another, the circumstances dictate they run. A whole range of everyday circumstances exist where it is common to witness such performances including the subject of this chapter, catching the train. In total, the five days I spent observing various points throughout Guildford Station resulted in 1,286 counts of people running and 542 of those instances being noted down. This allowed me to gain an in-depth understanding of this running form and how it differs from run-commuting as well as other running practices in terms of distance, speed, bodily comportments, motive force, assemblages and intention.

Staging Mobilities

Given the sole use of observation in this strand of the study, the holistic mobility framework was more difficult to implement in full. It is possible to present some of the very indicative brute facts of emergency-running however. Of the 1,286 runners observed, 53% were male and 47% females signifying emergency-running as having a much less gender-bias than run-commuting. Of the four locations observed in the train station, the underpass was by far the most common site of running with 39% of counts being recorded here. Platform 5 had the fewest runners; something anticipated given it is just one of eight platforms whereas other locations had passengers from all platforms.
passing through. Having said this, most observed runners did run to Platform 5 so there are other factors in this reduction that will be explored later. Emergency-running also appeared to be mostly a departing phenomenon, with those catching a train much more likely to run than those alighting at the station. Another notable rhythm of running in the station was the diurnal fluctuations (Fig. 13). Predictably the highest runners-per-hour (RPH) rate coincided with wider station, commuting and working-day rhythms, occurring in the morning and evening sessions with 35.72 RPH and 44.22 RPH respectively. Such figures are slightly misleading however as the flow of runners was anything but steady. A RPH measure hides the rhythm of train departures that can result in 20 runners in one minute and none for 15 minutes. The distance that people ran also fluctuated greatly between a single step to a couple of hundred metres. The small scale of running here questions what classes as transport. I would argue that even though point A and B are in the closest of proximity, the two points are still being traversed and thus a mode of transport has been used to do so. From the ethnographic notes (and remembering the bias already highlighted in these), teenagers seem to be the most likely emergency-runners with those in their elder years the least inclined to do so (Fig. 14). This may provide an indication as to why the highest RPH was witnessed in the evening slot, the only period when school children are departing the station.

![Figure 13. Runners-per-hour by time of day](image)
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Ole Jensen’s Staging Mobility framework (Fig. 15) provides an insightful heuristic to explore what else is at play during these moments of mobility (2013; 2014). Combining the material, policy and design with social interaction and embodied performance allows an exploration of how mobile spaces permit, encourage, facilitate, inhibit, restrict and impede particular movements; something of great interest in understanding running in a train station. Theoretically this framework draws on more-than-human understandings such as Actor-Network-Theory and assemblage theory (Jensen, 2014) in emphasising the agency of non-human actors; adding to work within the materialist (re)turn (Bennett, 2010; Whatmore, 2006).

I will use the staging mobilities framework to structure this exploration of emergency-running after a brief introduction to the setting – Guildford Station.
Guildford Station

Located to the south of the town (Fig. 16) and with over nine million entrances, exits and interchanges a year (Office of Rail Regulation, 2014), Guildford station acts as a major site of mobile sociofrugals and sociopetals (Jensen, 2014). Its eight platforms draw passengers in from and disperse passengers to various locations across the South East (Fig. 17). Although predominantly a space of transit, Guildford station also serves as a commercial space and a passage conduit hosting both shops and a public walkway to allow easier access from one side of the station to the other. This can be seen in the station plan (Fig. 18) which also highlights the four observations sites within the station.
Figure 16. Guildford Town Plan. Guildford Borough Council, 2008
Figure 17. Guildford rail connections. Surrey County Council, undated
Figure 18. Guildford station plan. South West Trains, undated.
**Staging Emergency-Running From Above**

Encompassing a broad set of influences that emanate from the physical site of the train station, the processes that flow through it and policies that founded them; a complex picture of affording and inhibiting emergency-running is painted from actants that stage from above. No explicit running policy by South West Trains could be found but it is clearly not something they seek to encourage. In a conversation about the research with the station manager one morning, he said to me ‘can you tell runners to stop running? We allow walking in here but not running, cycling or scooting. It’s too dangerous and causes too many accidents’. There is however, no way for runners to know such a standpoint and although South West Trains do display this poster asking ‘why run the risk?’ (Fig. 19) at some of their stations, it is not exhibited at Guildford.

![Figure 19. The dangers of emergency-running.](image)
The train timetables are by far the biggest influence on emergency-running, the scheduling of trains departures orchestrating the rhythms of passengers into the station and conducting the patterns of emergency-runners. The fastest train to London Waterloo is the largest stimulus, which departs Platform 5 four times an hour. On-site however, there are a range of material, design and non-human things that impact upon emergency-running. These include surfaces, obstacles, announcements, trains, displays and whistles – all things capable of encouraging and discouraging emergency-running. Different factors become salient and affective at different locations, creating an interesting geography that incorporates many senses and much stuff.

The ticket hall (Fig. 20) is a complex situation that must be negotiated to gain access to departing trains. It is a space with many obstacles and activities that require both stillness and mobility: ticket-buying, time-checking, ticket-validating. It is a commercial space with Costa Coffee, Marks & Spencer’s and WHSmiths encouraging people to linger, wait and relax alongside its prime function as a space of transit. It is thus, a space of conflicting rhythms were passengers for different trains, with different senses of haste all intermingle. No departure announcements can be heard in the ticket hall so passengers are reliant on the display boards for information regarding their train. This can be both a source to encourage and continue emergency-running when departures are imminent or a source to discourage and even halt emergency-running when time is plentiful or delays being experienced:

A man in his late 20s wearing work attire and trainers jogs in, slowing to eye up the display. He takes his earphones out and scrutinises the board closer before popping them back in and sprints, slaloming around two others before getting to the barrier.

An old woman in a body warmer, walking trousers and running trainers turns the corner running looking very red in the face. She glances at the board and continues to run. She suddenly stops, re-looks at the display and proceeds to walk.

Ticket Hall 09/07/2014 16.43
The obstacles in the ticket hall are objects that collect queues, meaning it is unpredictable how long the ticket hall will take to pass through. This results in many running into the station and between obstacles up to ten minutes before their train only to continue walking once they are negotiated. The platforms are visible here but the proximity is misleading, the actual distance needing to be covered being considerably longer; adding once more to the unpredictability of this complex site.

Figure 20. The ticket hall

*N.B not to scale*

The gateline (Fig. 21) is a simpler situation to negotiation, the solitary but significant obstruction to seamless passage being the ticket barrier. In principle its operation is simple. It is however, a task fraught with human and object deficiencies when bags get stuck in closing gates, tickets refuse to be
read and a gate's direction is misapprehended. Such events can inflict further stillness onto a moving body; something intensified when moving at speed:

Three friends run to the barrier shouting 'rush rush rush'. One gets through and sprints but halts when others' tickets get stuck. One girl doesn't wait long and sprints off with the others shouting 'wait for us'. The ticket is finally sorted and the other two sprint off and split.

Gateline 24/06/2014 16.31

Such is the unpredictability of this barrier that the sight of people only breaking into a run once it had been traversed was extremely common. Generally this occurred from three minutes prior to departure and in many ways it marked a threshold in navigating the station, representing the final physical and ubiquitous barrier before reaching the train. Announcements, whistles and door beeps can now be heard from the gateline yet only had an impact on emergency runners on platform two. Whereas, the display boards were mostly redundant here, only being used in abnormal conditions such as delays and cancellations, at which point they can have a large impact on the emergency-runner:

A girl in her 20s holding books and dressed in a cardigan, top and leggings run bouncily and slowly from the gateline. Staring at the display as she passes, she bites her lip noting her train is imminent and she increases her speed.

Gateline 10/07/2014 08.55
The underpass (Fig. 22) was the most interesting site where connection to the station above and the clues as to a train’s progress are almost totally cut off. The visible clues of approaching trains are replaced by an artificially lit tunnel with dripping mould, dirtied magnolia walls and a black asphalt floor. The audible clues of announcements, whistles and beeps are muffled and become replaced with the echoing and reverberating sounds of footsteps, chatter and the deep, imposing rumble of suitcases. This noise mirrors the sound of a train engine starting-up above, growling through the roof of the underpass, before thwacking with an ever-increasing tempo as it pulls away over the tracks; a significant influence upon emergency-runners. This space provides the least predictability about the chances of catching the intended train and was host to the most emergency-runners in the study, the majority of whom would run between one and three minutes prior to departure. The topography had a significant part to play in encouraging/forcing emergency-running here also. Those entering the underpass must travel downslope at a gradient at which gravity seems to have an impact.

Figure 21. The gateline

\textit{N.B not to scale}
on the speed at which one travels. This leads to many people speeding-up downhill, making it easier for those already running, nudging those who are contemplating it and involuntarily forcing some walkers to break into a couple of steps jog:

A girl in her 20s is walking very quickly down the ramp in sandals. As she approaches the bottom, the gradient involuntarily forces her to run the last few steps before being able to return to a quick walk on the flat.

Arriving at platform five (Fig. 23) from the seclusion of underpass, passengers are met by an open but covered platform that offers little in the way of obstacles to an awaiting train. Predictability is at its highest here, the visible and actual distance are the same and the muffled or missing audible and visible clues of approaching trains, display boards, announcements and whistles now return.
Certainty about a passenger’s fate is virtually possible once the up-ramp to platform five has been reached, which is one reason why a drop in the number of emergency-runners was witnessed. Most people run too early from other parts of the station, unsure of how long it will take them to reach the platform and can usually therefore reduce to a walk by the time that reach platform five. Only those who are genuinely at risk of missing the train actually need to run all the way and this is evident by runners only appearing around one to two minutes prior to departure (train door shut 30 seconds before). This certainty can be confirmed by the sight of empty platform, a confirmation of the time till departure and a judgement of the time it would take to travel the remaining distance:

A middle aged man in a checked shirt, light blue jeans and with bouncy mid-length black locks turns the corner with a seemingly determined mid-pace run. After a quarter of the way up he realises the train is not yet stationary so he will make it and reduces to a steady power walk with a flick of the hair.

Platform Five 14/07/2014 07.16

The other major reason for a drop in emergency-running is, once again, topography. Similar to the downhill's affect of increasing corporeal velocity, an uphill slope has a retarding effect. This is both physical, climbing a hill is physically demanding, difficult and tiresome; and mental, the prospect of running up a hill is unappealing to many. Together these have resulted in a reduction in the number of runners but also a considerable of number of emergency-runners stopping before or at some point on the ramp:

Prompted by some passing teens a middle aged and slightly stumpy woman attempts to run laden with bags that her body can’t contend with. She slumps, her legs low as she struggles uphill. She walks for a few steps, readjusting the bags she continues, walking once more as the bodily bounce and sways make her bags fall once again.

Platform Five 14/07/2014 18.00
People are persuaded to start their run on the up ramp however and these often come from the audible clues. Announcements are made for approaching trains, the first around 150 seconds before its arrival, the second around 20 seconds before arrival and the third when the train is stationary on the platform. Coming from the muffling environment of the underpass, passengers are often unaware which announcement they are hearing, resulting in many running unnecessarily:

The first announcement of the 0734 train causes two middle aged people half way along the ramp and with perfect vision of the platform to begin to jog with concerned looks. Their heads and torsos immediately drop and lean forward as the uphill slope contorts their bodies. At the crest of the incline, both reduce back to a walk with the train not yet arrived.

Platform Five 14/07/2014 07.30

Others, probably habitual travellers, seem calm when announcements are being made, often waiting for the sound of a conductor's whistle, signalling that the doors are about to close or even the noise of beeping doors signalling their imminent closure before breaking into a full run:

A middle aged woman with blond hair and in a black suit with a navy blouse holds her handbag in her left hand and the Metro in her right. Despite the train being on the platform, she confidently walks up ⅓ of the ramp. However a toot of the whistle and the beeping of the doors a few seconds later results in a frenzied head glance to the left, spotting the train and an even more frenzied run. She struggles to accelerate on the incline with her waddling movement but on the flat she covers the 5 metres to the nearest open door more easily.

Platform Five 14/07/2014 07.06
Each site throughout the station affords, encourages, inhibits and restricts emergency-running as material and non-human elements change resulting in a changing level of predictability as wayfinding/progress-reporting clues become cues for the taking up or halting of emergency running. However, such sites do not act autonomously, there is a staging from below that also occurs in which people recognise, understand, ignore, resist, accept, or juxtapose such cues as well as providing their own stimuli. Importantly, the emergency-running is also lived and experienced.
**Social Interaction - Staging Emergency-Running from Below**

Most emergency-running takes place when the station is at its busiest, placing much importance on the impact of others and those one is mobile-with when emergency-running. One way social interactions have an impact on emergency-running is by acting as a cue. The sound and sight of emergency-running can prompt others, who were previously content with walking, to become concerned enough to break into a run:

A woman in her 30s wearing boots, jeans and a top strides to the barrier, staring at the platform as she does. Once through the gateline she opens her legs for a comfortable rangy stride down the ramp. A man who had been hanging around for a minute goes ‘o’. He looks around quickly at the display and back at the platform. He is unsure if he needs to go. Halting for a split second he stares back at the woman running down the ramp and decides to run also.

**Gateline 10/07/2014 12.54**

This was particularly prominent in the underpass, which amplifies the sound of running, footsteps seeming to encroach upon others. It is also a space in which the likelihood is increased that those present are destined for the same train. Therefore emergency-runners can act as a significant influence to motivate others to run:

A young Asian woman walks briskly down the ramp, eyeing the display. Upon hearing the running footsteps of loafers belonging to a middle aged man behind, she opts to run also.

**Underpass 24/06/2014 12.16**

Not all passengers are persuaded to run upon seeing/hearing others doing so however, and emergency-runners often have to negotiate a route through space and a past mobile-others who are
moving with different degrees of haste. Research has already highlighted the range of strategies runners adopt to manage passing-by on the street (Cook, 2013). In the site of the train station however, runners are faced with a vastly increased number of mobile others and space that is more restrictive and dangerous – making the task altogether more difficult, often resulting in agitated and spasmodic running. There are no conventions for negotiating such situations and emergency-runners will often adopt strategies that suit their abilities and demeanour:

Two women in their 20s are trying to run down the slope against a barrage of up-comers occupying the majority of the ramp. The smaller, more agile woman takes shorter steps to carve a route through whilst the taller women opts to walk until the crowd has passed upon which she opens he legs wide and sprints to platform 5/6. Both women enter the up-ramp together.

Underpass 11/07/2014 08.01

On occasion, the stream of emergency-runners is large enough that rather than strategies being made on the individual basis, ad hoc and in situ solutions are established:

Ten runners pound down the ramp for the Waterloo train. Walkers react to the noise and all move to the right leaving a virtual fast lane that helps the situation to be negotiated with ease.

Underpass 11/07/2014 17.58

The other notable social interaction that occurs when emergency-running is that of co-running. A task that requires habitual joint outings to accomplish successfully (Allen-Collinson, 2008) the unplanned and erratic nature of emergency-running results in co-running that is charged with contestation. All parties will have different inclinations to run, different ideas about the acceptability of running, different thoughts about when to transition, different speeds, different tolerances, different endurances, different abilities and different materialities. There is much to contend with
when co-running and is something that can result in both the encouragement and discouragement to run:

Four teenage female friends enter the ramp and three start to run. Half way down the ramp one starts walking until the one furthest back catches up running and starts pushing the walker. ‘We didn’t have to do this much running for Duke of Edinburgh’ she says tiredly and unimpressed. A few steps later after observing the board she says ‘ok we probably do need to run now’. Resignedly plods off.

Underpass 11/07/2014 16.32

A group of about 20 Spanish students enter the ramp walking. The awesome sound echoes around the underpass. One boy, about 9, called Felipe squeezes through a gap on the right hand side and runs to the front. There are cries of ‘ey’ and ‘ah’ from the other kids, turning towards the adult. She tells him that running is prohibited and to calm down.

Underpass 11/07/2014 16.09

As these vignettes demonstrate, emergency-running can be experienced very differently by each emergency-runner, which leads us to explore the final aspect of the staging mobilities framework, that of embodied performances.

**Embodied Performances – Staging Emergency-Running from Below**

The image that springs to mind when picturing a runner is one rarely matched by those undertaking emergency-running. Due to the unanticipated nature of emergency-running, there are very few instances of sportswear being worn. In this respect, an emergency-runner is not identifiable by the
clothes they wear (as running attire can usually do – Allen-Collinson, 2010), only the actions they take. In fact, when not running, emergency-runners merge back into the crowd, the majority wearing ordinary fashion clothes or work attire (suits, dresses and smart shoes). The emergency-runner-assemblage is completed with a whole range of accoutrements that were present with fluctuating degrees of ubiquity. Although spotted, occasions of runners carrying trees and chairs were a rarity; ‘things’ such as suitcases, drinks, tickets, bikes and bags being the most widespread additions to a runner’s body. These materialities of the emergency-runner have a great affect on the running itself – contorting, restricting or freeing bodies, changing postures, altering styles and impacting comfort. As such a kaleidoscopic display of running styles and corporeal postures are encapsulated within emergency-running, challenging the observation made by John Bale (2004) that all running is identical in its external form. While there is no normal running style, some postures are posited as more desirable or efficient for running and demonstrate a body’s aptitude for running. This tends to include an upright head, straight back, arms bent at right angles swinging from shoulder sockets to trouser pockets, high hips, high knee lifts and springy feet bounces with the reduction of tension in joints and muscles. Observing emergency-runners however, it is possible to witness a whole gamut of running styles that can stray very far from this ideal including bounding, prancing, shuffling, scuttling, flat-running, half-running, shimmying, waddling and many more. Indeed, a desired running style was a very rare sight.

Once more a bag was the most common addition to the body but rather than the specially engineered rucksack of a run-commuter, the bags of emergency-runners come in all shapes and sizes, having different impacts depending on its size, weight and position. On the whole bags tend to unbalance the body, restrict the number of limbs available to run with and cause a swaying and lowering of the body. Running also affects the bag and its contents, the rhythmic bobbing having the potential to destabilise, damage or spoil items inside. It is therefore not uncommon to see emergency-runners using their hands and arms to support bags or trying to run flat, minimising the vertical bobbing and therefore damaging potential. Such is the unbalancing, uncomfortable and off-putting nature of wearing a bag unsuitable for running, some emergency-runners modify their
positions and assemblages to make this running easier; tightening straps, doing up zips, repacking and redistributing weight:

A middle aged man in white shirt and beige chinos walks through the barriers, slaloms past off-comers on platform two whilst jogging to put his ticket away. Once this is complete he redistributes the weight of his two carrier bags evenly before running much more quickly down to platform one with a bounding motion.

Gateline 24/06/2014 08.06

Such alterations of running styles and assemblage compositions can also be seen when emergency-runners are carrying more precarious items, most notably unsealed drinks:

A middle aged man in trousers and a shirt performs a sit-down run when only distance and no height or rhythm are aimed for. His legs are bent, his hips low and uses no arms at all. Whilst not great for running, this does ensure the Costa Coffee he is holding isn’t spilt.

Underpass 11/07/2014 07.40

It is not just the cartable items that can impact so greatly on one’s ability to run and do so with comfort. Clothing and shoe choice also act in such affective ways. The common donning of high heels made a particularly noticeable impact on female running bodies (as well as an auditory presence). Their calf-raising properties and reduced floor-contact-area often resulted in a tentative cagey running style, balancing the need to catch the train against the increased slipping hazard. Flip-flop runners, of which there were eight, suffered similar trade-offs between speed and injury resulting in a comparably cagey run whereas those in more appropriate footwear were of surer-footing.

Although of no particular health and safety risk, clothing choices equally impacted upon emergency-runners ability to run. Tighter clothes such as suits, dresses and skirts restrict leg movement and results in a staccato-like running style with short but quick steps. Clothing with a bit of flexibility
seemed most well-suited to meet the needs of emergency-runners but those with too much equally inhibited runners’ ability to just run:

A man in his late 20s has to pull up his baggy beige trousers several times as his runs along the underpass.

Underpass 11/07/2014 13.37

This variety of embodied running styles does not only result from the other ‘stuff’ of emergency-runners however. Their own levels of fitness and health clearly have their part to play what this running looks like and how it feels. There are those who transition from walking to emergency-running without a hint of unease, taking the running in their stride and exuding a sense of relaxedness:

A school boy runs down the ramp in the most relaxed and flowing style. He is practically suspended in the air as he moves his legs to the full extent and his arms swing freely. The floating of his hair and untucked shirt seem to match the grace and elegance of his easy run.

Underpass 11/07/2014 12.58

Others however are much less comfortable running, portraits of concern and difficulty painted on their faces. Running does not appear to come naturally to all, with styles that are forced and awkward and regularly results in stopping the run much sooner than others. For those who find running difficult, the topography of the station can accentuate these traits, the uphill ramps warping bodies grappling its gradient and the downslopes increasing the pressure exerted on knees, exaggerating balance-reflexes or bodily contours:

A large middle aged man in a cream suit and fedora hat sees the train half way up the ramp, his eyes having been focussed downward up till now. Through his sun glasses I see his eyes pop wide and he begins to run, struggling with his own body and the gradient – his legs barely get any height and his body rolls heavily from side to side.
It looks almost like a prolonged fall. Breathing heavily as he passes me, the doors are already locked and he mutters to himself ‘missed it’.

Platform Five 14/07/2014 13.33

A plump girl in her 20s wearing a short blue dress, heels and a trench coat runs awkwardly downhill, practically tip-toeing with short steps and an arm that swings in and out like a hinge to counterbalance the heavy bag on her right arm. The running rhythm is bouncing her large bosom uncomfortably (physically and socially) and her flappy dress is revealing the lower reaches of her buttocks.

Underpass 11/07/2014 08.28

Despite all of the important exogenous or bodily influences on the posture, style and comfort of emergency-runners, the most common reason for the unusual styles was simply a lack of commitment to running. Even those who seemed to be of reasonable fitness, were unburdened and wearing appropriate clothes would rarely run in a way that it looked like an ordinary run unless the risk of missing a train was too high. Instead emergency-runners would shuffle and scuttle, they would jog in a way that it looked like they weren’t running and they were inclined to reduce back to a walk. The number of emergency-runners who ran-walked-ran-walked-ran was very high, indeed it was the most common trait of emergency-running situations noted down. There appears to be a real aversion to running among station passengers, only on occasion do people looked pleased to be doing it. Undoubtedly the body-temperature raising and sweat-causing outcomes of running is one reason for this, something I presume to be undesired for those not dressed for the occasion and without the moorings to manage it (showers etc). There was also the sense that running was perhaps out of place here or that needing to dash for the train, negotiating all of the obstacles the material site poses, passing-by more punctual others, beginning to sweat, cheeks becoming rosier and breath becoming deeper was embarrassing.
Two teenage girls jogging down the ramp reach the bottom before stopping and observing the board. ‘O no we’ve got twenty minutes’. ‘Really? This is so embarrassing. Why did we run?’

Underpass 11/07/2014 15.36

The embodiment of emergency-running is a product of the affordances of the material site, the material and human obstacles, the affective power of accoutrements, a person’s physical ability, their body shapes and their ideas around the acceptability of running in a station. All of which combine to assemble a form of running quite unlike any other researched hitherto.

Conclusion

The train station is an extraordinary site of running that not only demonstrates running’s significant role in facilitating train travel but questions where the spaces of sport and exercise are to be found - where these mobilities belong. If you want to find running, a train station may be more fruitful than the athletics track. This hitherto unstudied form of running has challenged understandings of the practice – what it looks like, how it happens and why people do it. Whilst a scarcity of time until a train departure is the overriding reason for running, this exploration of Guildford Station has revealed that such running is both encouraged and discouraged through a range of materials sites, social interactions and embodied performances of unprepared bodies. It has also hinted at reasons why some people do not run or run half-heartedly, centring on understandings of running as being difficult and embarrassing or socially unacceptable. As such, much of the running observed at the station should more accurately be termed urgency-running given the lack of full-committal-sprinting on display. In turn, this opens up a research agenda about the negative experiences and meanings of running, something that will be of importance if running-transport is going to be encouraged. Towards such ends, this chapter has also highlighted the very important fact that running-transport is not just for runners and is used by a whole range of people as a form of transport in their daily
lives. Indeed run-commuters are not the most common transport-runners - that title belongs to the ordinary-but-lacking-punctuality-train-passenger. As well as enabling a better appraisal of running’s potential as a transport mode, this work could be used to help curb running in train stations, given the danger it is deemed to pose.
Part Three
Running as a Transport Mode?

Through the exploration of running’s use in commuting practices and as an emergency mobility, some interesting and important understandings about its role as a form of transport have been gained. I am therefore able to undertake an initial but informed appraisal of running’s function as a transport mode, considering its utilitarian and experiential aspects to provide some suggestions of its potential to expand, facilities needed to encourage it and what part it could play in transport policy and planning. This is however a preliminary assessment with preliminary suggestions. A much deeper analysis is required to make any authoritative statement, bringing into account the views of non-runners, employees and transport planners, and drawing much more heavily on literature in transportation research, most notably other studies into active commuting. There is much to learn from other research, policy and practice in regards to active commuting that unfortunately won’t be tapped into here (see Pooley et al, 2013) but comparing running-transport to such other modes will be a research imperative considering, as has already been documented, the competition/relationship there is between such modes.

The Benefits of Running-Transport

There are a range of advantages of run-commuting as a transport mode that are summarised in Table II.
Table II. Benefits of running as a form of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Health and Well-Being | • Those who commute to work by active modes of transports have significantly lower Body Mass Index and percentage body fat than counterparts commuting by private transport (Flint et al, 2014).  
• The positive mental benefits of running can include the alleviation of some symptoms associated with mild to moderate depression; improving self-image, improving social skills, improving cognitive functions and reduce symptoms of anxiety (Barr Taylor et al, 1985; Paluska and Schwenk, 2000).  
• 98% of the survey said keeping healthy was important in their transport choice  
• 96.6% stated the mental benefits were important to them  
• The sense of ‘buzz’ and increased productivity is a significant advantage on a personal, company and society level. |
| Safety           | • Safety fears in regards to run-commuting were practically non-existent.  
• Evident in greater gender equality. |
| Just             | • In theory running can be a very just form as transport (most people can run). |
| Environmental    | • 66.2% of participants appreciated the environmental benefits running has as a form of transport.  
• The journey itself emits only the greenhouse gases the body releases during exercise.  
• The detriment caused to the environment in the production of running gear and an increased number of showers are negligible in comparison to the environmental footprint of other transport modes. |
| Cost             | • 60.7% of participants said the low cost of running was important to them.  
• Cost per trip is zero. |
• Lower initial outlay than cycling, with the essentials of trainers and a rucksack coming in considerably under the price of a bike at about £30 - £50 each for middle of the range items.

Uninhibited
• Very free and flexible transport mode, unrestricted by routes, infrastructures or timetables.
• It can be done at any time, on any route, at any speed and has an almost 100% reliability rate.

Productive
• Running-commuting allows for many other things to be done on the run or during the time it frees.

Ludic
• Run-commuting was regularly expressed as being very enjoyable.

The Disadvantages of Running-Transport

Running certainly does have its drawbacks as a form of transport however and Table III provides a summary of these.

Table III. Drawbacks of running as a form of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>• Running can be a very difficult form of getting around, resulting in sweaty and tired bodies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Distance | • The difficulty severely limits the distance for which such transport can be utilised.  
• For frequent runners, a maximum runnable distance of about ten miles was posited.  
• There also appears to be a minimum distance worth running. |
| Speed | • The difficulty of running severely limits the speed at which such transport can |
be utilised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight limits</th>
<th>• Very little can be carried when running as a running body simply cannot withhold much weight and still maintain a run.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on other modes</td>
<td>• Other modes help to facilitate running by travelling part way by another means or ensuring the stuff that can’t be carried is at the appropriate locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex logistics</td>
<td>• Actualising running-transport involves the harmonising of many of life rhythms and the movement of objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Run-commuting is a highly logistical feat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>• The physical ability of the person undertaking the running can be a large disadvantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are those without the ability to run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some people don’t have the fitness for running-transport to be an efficient form of transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Injuries can strike at almost any point severely limiting one’s ability to travel by running.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential to Expand**

Running as a transport mode would appear then to only satisfy the requirements of a small criterion of trips. Yet it can provide a very healthy, efficient, enjoyable, environmentally-friendly, just, cheap and fun form of transport for those trips. On average each person in the England makes 417 trips a year that are within the runnable distance range (DfT, 2014b) but it is highly unlikely that all of these trips done by running or every person in England would like to run as their mode of transport. The previous chapter demonstrated that you don’t have to be a runner to use running as a form of transport but there are many people who simply don’t like running and would not want to run by choice. The non-runners in this study would often blankly reply “I don’t run anywhere” (survey
response). These sentiments may be overlooking the role running plays in their emergency forms of mobility but does demonstrate the very different relationships people have with running. Initially, the greatest area for expansion is likely to be within the running community, those who already undertake the practice by choice, overcoming some of these immediate barriers. This population is around three million (who run at least once a month – Sport England, 2013) but the survey has revealed that around 10% of this group would never consider using running as a form of transport. For such people, there are just too many barriers to overcome to make running to work (or elsewhere) something they would consider. Many of these barriers have been touched upon in this study so far and include a range of geographies, temporalities, logistics, facilities and affects. Yet such barriers can be overcome as demonstrated in those who do run-commute. The overriding barrier to people taking up running as a form of transport is therefore mind-set; many just do not consider running to be a form of transport or could not perceive how they could make it work, the barriers being too many and too great. This mind-set can be overcome however and 62% of those who have done so would like to run to work more. This not only demonstrates running’s potential to expand as a predominantly urban form of local transport but the need to further break down barriers, to recognise the positive externalities of running-transport and undertake measures to encourage the practice.

Encouraging Running-Transport

Currently no formal transport policies, plans or strategies on run-commuting or running-transport exist anywhere in the world but a whole range of creative, community and business driven solutions have been established to fill this gap that. What follows is a range of ways to encourage running-transport and as will become clear, they are not too dissimilar to measure already being undertaken to promote alternative forms of active transport (Pooley et al, 2013), allowing running to either be indirectly encouraged by or easily incorporated into current strategies.
Many of the barriers to run-commuting corresponded to a lacking of ‘hard’ infrastructure, the physical stuff that allows running-transport to happen. As such, end of trip facilities including showers, lockers, water points, stretching areas, kitchen facilities, washing facilities and drying racks/rooms were promoted by run-commuters as important in providing for and encouraging running-transport. Others suggested en route hard infrastructure that would encourage the practice, including changes to the streetscape to incorporate a dedicated running lane with a softer surface and the installation of public water points.

A range of ‘weak’ or ‘informal’ infrastructures were also put forward as means by which to encourage running-transport. The difficulty of running with a bag led to the promotion of cycle escorts that carry your bag for you – a service already offered in London (see http://homerunlondon.com/). Others tackle the individual nature of run-commuting through the suggestion of running buses or groups. Some community-led groups do already exist but with a sporadic geography and small membership (see https://www.run2work.com/join-group/). The support of others can be very important in encouraging new people to transport-run, something recognised in Brazil by the recent establishment of the voluntary initiative corrida amiga or friendly running. This seeks to inspire and assist run-commuting through pairing people up with a corridaamiga - a running friend (see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MUN96cBtdCQ).

The casualisation of workplace environments could support run-commuting. Flexible working hours would allow more people to use this slower means of transport whilst still completing other responsibilities they may have, such as doing the school run. Equally allowing for more casual clothes to be worn at work can aid the amount a run-commuter may need to carry and relieve any worries about needing to keep a suit crease-free when running. A general supportive workplace was desired by most run-commuter and this could take the form of lunch-time run groups or other incentives. Some run-commuters discussed many inducements that would encourage run-commuting practices such as financial incentives for not driving, a free breakfast when having run to work, health insurance discounts (more prominent in respondents from the USA), corporate sponsorship for competing in running events or tax-free running gear (see Run2Work, 2014)
On the whole though, there is a drastic need to normalise run-commuting and running-transport practices to help reduce the biggest barrier - mind-sets. Public awareness campaigns, such as Run2Work, were highly endorsed by run-commuters along with suggestions that public health campaigns or adverts promoting run-commuting would be very useful. Within these, suggestions about how to actualise run-commuting and the procedures of run-commuting would be deemed useful, one respondent asking for the promotion of off-road and alternative routes suitable for run-commuting (something currently being developed by Run2Work but with a heavy London bias - https://www.run2work.com/search/).

There are no guarantees that such initiatives would work and that the rate of transport running would increase or become normalised. There are also questions regarding where to locate facilities and who should plan and pay for them. Most participants in the study seemed to favour workplace-based end of trip facilities but as both emergency-running and part-run-commuting demonstrate, some public and particularly train station facilities are required – water and toilets being the most commonly suggested. Running is experiencing a popularity high currently and the idea of run-commuting becoming more widespread. The last two years have seen a doubling in the number of run-commuters and the momentum of the 'movement' entails it will continue to increase and facilities, strategies and plans will need to put into place to accommodate running-transport. What have been presented in this chapter are some suggestions of how to do such a thing and the reasons why an individual, business or society may want to.
Home Straight: Conclusions

Beginning from the observation that running’s contemporary use as a form of transport was wholly unaccounted for in both the transport and mobilities literature, this study set out to conduct the first research into two such manifestation of running-transport; that of run-commuting and emergency-running. Seeking to make academic and policy provocations, this project has been wide-ranging, fascinating and thought-provoking. These brief conclusions offer a summary of what the project has done and what it has invited.

A Rundown of the Research

Run-commuting was found to be an emerging commuting mobility. Despite the number of people undertaking the practice having doubled in the last two years, only a small percentage actually commute this way everyday with the majority running to or from work 3 times a week or less. This entailed that run-commuting was always in a competition or relationship with another form of transport, either one being used on running off-days, being used to cover part of the commute when distances were too large or facilitating the moving of items too large or cumbersome for a runner to carry in a rucksack. The distances run-commuters travelled for work was vastly ranging, with a positive correlation in existence between commuting distance and likelihood of using running to commute only part of the distance. In terms of duration, the most frequent commuting duration was 60 minutes and above in which run-commuters would often use this time to explore new routes, transition from work to home or experience time-out. The notion of a runnable distance instated about 10 miles as a maximum and a minimum distance of around 1-3 miles. Such straight forward facts about the movement hides the complex logistical operation that takes places in actualising run-
commuting which includes balancing work duties, evening engagements, family’s transport habits, physical ability, the location of work items and training schedules. The latter was salient as many of the run-commuters were competitive runners who utilised their commute to undertake training, allowing it to harmonise with the rest of life’s rhythms. Discussions about the experience of run-commuting highlighted its sweaty and exhaustive qualities but that it was also a practice that led to an increased productivity and ‘buzz’. Run-commuting was deemed to part of the process of reimagining commuting practices and the value of travel-time, perceiving them not as a waste but of intrinsic value leading to a reassessment of what commuting looked like, felt like and what it could be.

Emergency-running, the use of running to get from A to B in lieu of other means when a situation dictates, was also explored. This mobile form is very different to other running practices as it was unplanned and often undesired. The chapter explored the way in which the material site played a role in facilitating, restricting, encouraging or discouraging emergency-running in Guildford Station; the 1286 runners observed were all in some way affected by the topography, atmospheres, signs, sounds and obstacles of the train station or the train itself. Using the staging mobilities framework, social interaction and the embodiment of such running were also explored to fully understand these moments of unplanned mobility. People in the station were capable of either persuading others to emergency-run or restrict them by blocking the passage. A runner’s body and accoutrements was the final aspect studied. Often in unsuitable clothing and laden with bags, cases and drinks, the unplanned nature of emergency-running meant such materialities had a significant impact on the running itself. The accoutrements of an emergency-runner could constrict, contort and alter a runner’s style, posture and ultimately comfort. Many run-commuters were found to run in such ways without such restrictions however, signalling the importance of social-acceptance and senses of embarrassment in embodying emergency-running. Overall, the aspect of the study demonstrated that a train station is an extraordinary site of running and that running-transport was not just the preserve of runners.
These empirical case studies were combined to form an initial appraisal of running’s prospect as a transport mode. Rating well on the environmental, financial and health fronts, running-transport also offers a very accessible and flexible form of transport that provides the opportunity to cut congestion, reduce travel time (in some cases) and use travel-time productively as well as improving productivity throughout the day. Its main drawbacks are the toil it requires to travel, the shorter distances and slower speeds it is possible of reaching, the inability to travel with much stuff and the heavy reliance of other forms of transport to enable running-transport. The biggest barrier to the uptake of run-commuting is the perception of running not being a mode of transport or it being too difficult to actualise. Yet the burgeoning population of runners and a momentum behind the idea of run-commuting suggests running-transport will continue to gain in popularity and steps need to be taken to encourage and facilitate this transport mode. A variety of suggestions that incorporate a range of ‘hard’ and ‘weak’ infrastructures, financial incentives and public awareness campaigns were all put forward over the course of the research. The latter was suggested to help normalise run-commuting practices that in turn, would allow for a more persuasive case for the end of trip facilities that are so key in enabling running-transport such as showers, lockers and water points. It was demonstrated that a few community/business led initiatives are already in place that provide some of these services but a more coherent strategy would be required if running-transport continues on its current trajectory. This research has suggested that running could be a very efficient local form of transport with many positive externalities, one that warrants the encouragement, facilities and promotion that other active transport modes have received.

**Wider Debates**

Whilst firmly focussed on the practices of running-transport, the research has also been able to tap into and add to many key debates occurring across human geography, most notably in the field of mobilities and transport studies. Research into running has been much forthcoming recently and this
work helps to widen the understandings of running practices and the meanings associated with it; challenging the conceptualisation that representations of running fall into three categories; sport, health and experience-orientated. Most notably, this work has started to introduce negative understandings of running and to demonstrate that there is no single figure of ‘the runner’; running takes place for many different reasons and is experienced very differently. Much of this has centred on running being conceptualised as predominately a leisure practice but one being utilised as a transport mode. As such, this adds to a growing literature about the textures, complexities and policy implications of such mobile forms that traverse the border between leisure and transport. Most recently seen with the cycling (Aldred and Jungnickel, 2012), this border-crossing also has historical precedent as Merriman’s (2012) account of driving’s struggles to be accepted as a form of transport rather than a leisure activity of polite society attest.

Positioning running on this boundary throughout the project, understanding the experiential and utilitarian, has allowed for aspects more familiar to mobilities studies and those more familiar to transport geography be studied. In turn, this has demonstrated the value of both disciplines in studying forms of movement and the value in working across the transport-mobilities spectrum identified by Shaw and Hesse (2010). The use of two mobilities frameworks, Cresswell’s holistic mobility framework (2001; 2006; 2010) and Jensen’s staging mobility framework (2013; 2014), have be consummate in this endeavour, enabling different facets of mobile forms to be brought to the fore and although simplifications, demonstrating their worth as heurists. The latter had the additional value of focussing attention on the material design of the mobile sites, drawing on more-than-human geographies, assemblage theories and materialist turns to contribute work to the emerging field Jensen terms mobilities design (2014).

This focus has allowed for more informed policy and transport strategy implications to be suggested, which adds to a growing literature surrounding sustainable, alternative and active forms of transport but through a hitherto uncontemplated mode of transport. Running as a form of transport has challenged what transport is, in particular emergency-running has tested the boundaries of what counts as a form of transport being very slight in distance and duration. This work also added to
arguments about reimagining the commute, deeming travel-time of having worth in its own right (Jain and Lyons, 2008), conducting many activities on-the-run and providing evidence as to why run-commuters may select a slower mode of transport and often purposefully increase distances.

**Setting the Running-Transport Agenda**

The confines of a master's dissertation unfortunately does not provide the space to fully explore running as transport and as such many additional questions have been raised through this project that I suggest are important for taking this work forward and bringing out more of the complex geographies of this textured practice. Firstly, I suggest just an increase in the amount, scope and depth of research into running-transport practices. Secondly, the notion of a minimum runnable distance needs to be much better excavated and its implications for policy and academia fully appreciated. Thirdly, there is a need to more fully bring into account the views of people that don’t run and to explore the negative meanings and experiences of running – an imperative if considering running-transport’s potential to expand. Fourthly, and relatedly, a proper investigation of schemes already in place to support run-commuting would be most welcome along with comparisons to initiatives aimed at cycling and walking. Fifthly, the London bias of this study could be investigated, probing whether it is in some way leading the way for run-commuting and why or just a coincidence of geography. Penultimately, observing the spaces of run-commuting on a micro-scale to understand where running is deemed acceptable and where it is out of place would be important and lastly, this study has also brought to light the many other reasons running is used to get from point A to point B. Beyond just commuting and in forms of emergency, many forms of ludic running were displayed (mostly by children) and examining these running practices could be equally enthralling.

The dissertation has offered a timely first account of contemporary uses of running as a form of transport. Throughout it running has challenged understandings and accounts of transport and
transport has challenged understandings and experiences of running. The project was fostered out of a curiosity regarding the ways running is used and its apparent omission from transport studies and assessments. By working across the transport-mobilities continuum, the research has been able to make provocations relevant to academia and policy circles as well as inviting future research on a topic gaining much wider public, policy and academic recognition.
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Appendix 1 – Explanatory Survey
Thank you for your taking the time the fill out this survey. This forms part of a project undertaken by Simon Cook from the Department of Geography, Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

The questionnaire is about your commute to work and more specifically the use of running to get to and from work. The project is interested in collecting responses from both those who do and don't run-commute, so your participation is greatly appreciated regardless of your transport choices.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could answer the questionnaire fully, however if there are questions you are unhappy or uncomfortable answering you are more than welcome to skip them. Through the entire survey you have the right to withdraw at any stage. In compliance with the RHUL ethical guidelines, every participant is assured on anonymity and confidentiality - nobody will be identifiable or the data publicly available.
If there are any questions or wish to contact me you are more than welcome to by the following means: Email: Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk // Twitter: @SimonIanCook // Website: www.jographies.wordpress.co.uk

To begin the survey, please answer the following consent questions.

1. I confirm that I have read the introduction sheet and have asked any questions I may have *
   - Yes
   - No

2. I understand that my participation in voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reasons. *
   - Yes
   - No

3. I agree to take part in the study *
   - Yes
   - No
4. I agree that data gathered in this study may be stored anonymously and may be used for future research. *
   - Yes
   - No

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications. *
   - Yes
   - No

**About Your Work**

**Page description:**
Please answer the following questions about your work

6. What industry you work in?

   

7. How long have you worked for your current company?

   

8. What is your work's postcode?

   

9. How long have you been based in this location?

10. Please select the days of the week you work and provide details of your working hours in the space provided.

- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday
- Saturday
- Sunday

About your commute to and from work

Page description:
Please answer the following questions about your commute to and from work.

11. How far is your commute to work? Estimations are fine.

12. Please provide the postcode of where you begin your commute
13. How long have you lived in this location?

14. Do you ever use running to get to or from work? This could be for part of or the whole of your journey.

- Yes
- No

Run-Commuting

**Page entry logic:**
This page will show when: Question "Do you ever use running to get to or from work? This could be for part of or the whole of your journey." #14 = "Yes"

**Page description:**
You stated that you use running to get to or from work, please answer the following questions about your run-commute.

---

**Logic**
Show/hide trigger exists.

15. Is running your main mode of transport?

- Yes
- No

**Logic**
Dynamically shown if "Is running your main mode of transport?" = No

16. If running was not your main mode of transport, what is?
17. Please list all the modes of transport you use to get to or from work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. What determines which mode of transport you use?

[Blank space for answer]
19. Why do you use running to get to or from work? Please select all that apply and provide explanation in the space provided.

- [ ] Time savings
- [ ] Alternative route
- [ ] Lack of alternatives
- [ ] Cost
- [ ] Environmental concerns
- [ ] Health and fitness
- [ ] Parking issues
- [ ] Avoiding congestion
- [ ] Time pressures
- [ ] Mental benefits
- [ ] Socialising
- [ ] Other

20. How often do you travel using running?

21. Does the amount you run-commute change with the seasons? If yes, please explain how and why.


22. In which direction do you tend to run-commute?

- To work
- From work
- Both

23. How much of your journey to or from work do you run?

- Whole journey
- Over half
- Under half

24. What other transport mode(s) do you use to complete your journey when part-running?

Mode 1
Mode 2
Mode 3
Mode 4

25. In minutes, how long do you run for on average?

[Input Field]
26. Do you always run the same route when run-commuting?
   - Yes
   - Mostly
   - No

27. Is this route the most direct?
   - Yes
   - No

28. Is this the same route as you would travel using other modes of transport?
   - Yes
   - No
29. Please select all of the following transport infrastructures that you use during your run-commute.

- [ ] Pavement
- [ ] Road space
- [ ] Pedestrianised areas
- [ ] Alleyways and cut-throughs
- [ ] Trails and footpaths
- [ ] Cycle paths
- [ ] Other (please expand) *

30. Please explain what influences your choice of run-commuting route.


31. For how long have you been running to or from work?


32. Why did you start running to or from work?


33. What facilities do you have at your work place to aid or enable run-commuting?

34. Which of the following do you wear or hold when you run to or from work?

- [ ] Running trainers
- [ ] Running shorts/leggings
- [ ] Running top/vest/jacket
- [ ] Bag
- [ ] Water bottle
- [ ] Watch
- [ ] Ordinary work clothes

35. You stated that you carry a bag when run-commuting, what items are usually packed in it?
36. Is there anything that currently hinders you from running to or from work? If yes, please explain.

37. Would any of the following improve or encourage your run-commuting? Please provide other suggestions in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Already in place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockers at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public showers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public water points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax free running gear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated running lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. Are there any other times that you use running to get somewhere? If yes, please explain.

39. Is running your sport, hobby, leisure activity, past-time or exercise choice? If yes, please expand.

40. We are looking to undertake some interviews with people who run to or from work as part of the research. If you would be willing to be contacted, please provide a contact email address. This will only be used to contact you for the purposes of the research and will not be stored, distributed or published in any means.

Non Run-Commuting

Page entry logic:
This page will show when: Question "Do you ever use running to get to or from work? This could be for part of or the whole of your journey." #14 contains any ("No")

Page description:
You stated that you don't run to or from work, please answer the following questions regarding that.
41. Why don't you run to or from work?

42. Are you a runner or do you go running outside of getting to or from work?
   - Yes
   - No

43. Have you ever considered using running as a form of transport?
   - Yes
   - No

44. Would you ever consider running to or from work (all or part of the way)?
   - Yes
   - No
45. Would any of the following encourage you to run to or from work? Please provide other suggestions in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Already in place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockers at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public showers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public water points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax free running gear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated running lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Are there any times you do use running to get somewhere? If yes, please expand.


About You

Page description:
Please answer the following questions about you.
47. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

48. What is your age?

- 16-19
- 20-25
- 26-29
- 30-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65+

49. What is your ethnicity?


50. Do you have a limiting disability

- Yes
- No
51. Do you have children or other dependents?

- Yes
- No

Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important and greatly appreciated. If you need to get in contact at any point or would like to receive a copy of the research findings please contact Simon Cook on Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk
Appendix 2 – Descriptive Survey
Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. This forms part of a project undertaken by Simon Cook from the Department of Geography, Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

The questionnaire is about your commute to work and more specifically the use of running to get to and from work. The project is interested in collecting responses from both those who do and don’t run-commute, so your participation is greatly appreciated regardless of your transport choices.
It would be greatly appreciated if you could answer the questionnaire fully, however if there are questions you are unhappy or uncomfortable answering you are more than welcome to skip them. Through the entire survey you have the right to withdraw at any stage. In compliance with the RHUL ethical guidelines, every participant is assured on anonymity and confidentiality - nobody will be identifiable or the data publicly available.

If there are any questions or wish to contact me you are more than welcome to by the following means: Email: Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk // Twitter: @SimonIanCook // Website: www.jographies.wordpress.co.uk

To begin the survey, please answer the following consent questions.

1. I confirm that I have read the introduction sheet and have asked any questions I may have *
   - Yes
   - No

2. I understand that my participation in voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reasons. *
   - Yes
   - No
3. I agree to take part in the study *
   - Yes
   - No

4. I agree that data gathered in this study may be stored anonymously and may be used for future research. *
   - Yes
   - No

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications. *
   - Yes
   - No

About Your Work

Page description: Please answer the following questions about your work
6. What industry sector do you work in?

Accounting, banking and finance
Armed forces and emergency services
Business, consulting and management
Charities and voluntary work
Creative arts and culture
Energy and utilities
Engineering and manufacturing
Environment and agriculture
Health and social care
Hospitality, tourism and sport
IT and information services
Law
Marketing, advertising and PR
Media and publishing
Property and construction
Public sector
Recruitment and HR
Retail and sales
Science and pharmaceuticals
Teaching and education
Transport and logistics

7. What is your work postcode?

8. How long have you worked at this location?

- 1 year and under
- 2-5 years
- 5+ years
9. Do you work full time or part time

- Full time
- Part time

10. What are your normal weekly working days. Please tick as appropriate.

- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday
- Saturday
- Sunday

About your commute to and from work

Page description:
Please answer the following questions about your commute to and from work.
11. How far do you think your average daily commute to work is?

- < 2 miles
- 2 - 4.99 miles
- 5 - 6.99 miles
- 7 - 9.99 miles
- 10 - 19.99 miles
- 20 - 39.99 miles
- 40+ miles

12. Do you ever run to work, part or all of the way?

- Yes
- No

Run-Commuting

Page entry logic:
This page will show when: Question "Do you ever run to work, part or all of the way?" #12 is exactly equal to ("Yes")

Page description:
You stated that you use running to get to or from work, please answer the following questions about your run-commute.
13. How often do you run to or from work?
- Occasionally
- About once a month
- 2 or 3 times a month
- Once a week
- 2 or 3 times a week
- Everyday

14. Do you normally run to or from work?
- Normally run from home to work
- Normally run from work to home
- Both
15. What days of the week do you prefer to run to or from work? Please tick as appropriate.

- Monday
- Tuesday
- Wednesday
- Thursday
- Friday
- Saturday
- Sunday
- All

16. What is your primary mode of transport for your commute to or from work when not running?

- Train
- Tube
- Bus
- Walk
- Bike
- Car
- Other *
- None
17. What is the main reason you choose this mode of transport? Please tick one.

- It's the cheapest / most cost effective
- It's the most convenient from my home
- It's the quickest / most time effective
- It's the safest
- It's the healthiest
- It's good for the environment
- It's the only viable option

18. What is the main reason you run to or from work? Please only tick one.

- Saves time
- It's the only option
- Save me money
- Better for the environment
- Keeps me fit and healthy
- Quicker than other modes of transport
- Other

*
19. Are any of the following factors important to you when running to or from work? Please provide other factors in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saves me time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no viable alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saves me travel money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better for the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It keeps me fit and healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't park at my office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid traffic congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is good for my mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It allows me to travel through different places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Please indicate when you run to and from work?

- [ ] Generally throughout the year
- [ ] Summer only
- [ ] Winter only
21. How much of your journey to or from work do you run?

- Whole journey
- Over half
- Under half

22. What other transport mode(s) do you use to complete your journey when part-running?

- Walking
- Bike
- Train
- Tube
- Bus
- Car
- Other
23. In minutes, how long do you run for on average?

- < 10 minutes
- 10 - 14 minutes
- 15 - 19 minutes
- 20 - 24 minutes
- 25 - 29 minutes
- 30 - 39 minutes
- 40 - 49 minutes
- 50 - 59 minutes
- 60 + minutes

24. Do you always run the same route when run-commuting?

- Yes
- Mostly
- No

25. Is this route the most direct?

- Yes
- No
Is this the same route as you would travel using other modes of transport?

- Yes
- No

Please select which infrastructures you use during your run-commute.

- Pavement
- Road space
- Pedestrianised areas
- Alleyways and cut-throughs
- Trails and footpaths
- Cycle paths
- Other (please expand) *

For how long have you been running to or from work?

- < 1 year
- 1 - 2 years
- 3 - 5 years
- 5 + years
29. Do you run to or from work with a rucksack?

- Yes
- No

30. Do you ever run during your lunch-break?

- Yes
- No

31. Does your employer have sufficient showers and lockers at your office for you to change in?

- Yes
- No

32. Are there any other facilities you have at your workplace that enable you to run-commute?
33. Do you use a gym to shower and change at the end of your run-commute?

- All of the time
- Sometimes
- Never

34. In regards to the amount you run-commute, how would you like that to change in the future?

- I'd like to run to or from work more
- I'd like to run to or from work less
- I'd like to maintain my current level of run-commuting
35. In your view, would any of the following encourage more people to run to or from work? Please provide other suggestions in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockers at work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers at work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points at work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lockers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public showers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public water points</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax free running gear</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated running lane</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Is running your sport, hobby, or exercise choice?

- Sport
- Hobby
- Exercise choice
37. We are looking to undertake some interviews with people who run to or from work as part of the research. If you would be willing to be contacted, please provide a contact email address. This will only be used to contact you for the purposes of the research and will not be stored, distributed or published in any means.

Non Run-Commuting

Page entry logic:
This page will show when: Question "Do you ever run to work, part or all of the way?" #12 is one of the following answers ("No")

Page description:
You stated that you don't run to or from work, please answer the following questions regarding that.

38. Do you run outside of getting to or from work?
- Yes
- No

39. Have you ever considered using running as a form of transport?
- Yes
- No
40. Would you ever consider running to or from work (all or part of the way)?

- Yes
- No

41. Would any of the following encourage you to run to or from work? Please provide other suggestions in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Already in place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockers at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lockers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public showers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public water points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax-free running gear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated running lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About You

Page description:
Please answer the following questions about you.
42. What is your gender?
  - Female
  - Male

43. What is your age?
  - 16-19
  - 20-25
  - 26-29
  - 30-34
  - 35-44
  - 45-54
  - 55-64
  - 65+

44. Do you have a limiting disability
  - Yes
  - No
45. Do you have children or other dependents?

- Yes
- No

Thank You!

Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important and greatly appreciated. If you need to get in contact at any point or would like to receive a copy of the research findings please contact Simon Cook on Simon.Cook.2013@live.rhul.ac.uk